



EXAMINATION OF THE U. S. AIR FORCES AIRCRAFT SUSTAINMENT NEEDS IN THE FUTURE AN

Michael Clarke
NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

10/23/2015
Final Report

DISTRIBUTION A: Distribution approved for public release.

Air Force Research Laboratory
AF Office Of Scientific Research (AFOSR)/ RTB2
Arlington, Virginia 22203
Air Force Materiel Command

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
<p>The public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing the burden, to Department of Defense, Executive Services, Directorate (0704-0188). Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.</p> <p>PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ORGANIZATION.</p>					
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 26-10-2015		2. REPORT TYPE Final Performance		3. DATES COVERED (From - To) 15-07-2010 to 31-12-2011	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE EXAMINATION OF THE U. S. AIR FORCES AIRCRAFT SUSTAINMENT NEEDS IN THE FUTURE AND ITS STRATEGY TO MEET THOSE NEEDS				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER FA9550-10-1-0411	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER 61102F	
6. AUTHOR(S) Michael Clarke				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES 2101 CONSTITUTION AVE NW WASHINGTON, DC 204180006 US				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) AF Office of Scientific Research 875 N. Randolph St. Room 3112 Arlington, VA 22203				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S) AFRL/AFOSR RTB2	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT A DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED: PB Public Release					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT <p>The ability of the United States Air Force (USAF) to keep its aircraft operating at an acceptable operational tempo, in wartime and In peacetime, has been important to the Air Force since its inception. This is a much larger issue The ability of the United States Air Force (USAF) to keep its aircraft operating at an acceptable operational tempo, in wartime and in peacetime, has beenimportant to the N.r Force since its inception.This is a much larger issue for the Air Force today, having effectively been at war for 20 years, with its aircraft becoming increasingly more expensive to operate and maintain and with military budgets certain to further decrease. The enormously complex Air Force weapon system sustainment enterprise is currently constrained on many sides by laws, policies, regulations and procedures, relationships, and organizational issues emanating from Congress, the Department of Defense (DoD). and the Air Force itself. Against the back-drop of these stark realities. the Air Force requested the National Research Council (NRC) of the National Academies, under the auspices of the Air Force Studies Board to conduct and in-depth assessment of current and future Air Force weapon system sustainment initiatives and recommended future courses of action for consideration by the Air Force.</p>					
15. SUBJECT TERMS AIRCRAFT, SUSTAINMENT					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UU	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON Michael Clarke
a. REPORT Unclassified	b. ABSTRACT Unclassified	c. THIS PAGE Unclassified			

				19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER <i>(Include area code)</i> 202-334-2795
--	--	--	--	---

Examination of the U.S. Air Force's Aircraft Sustainment Needs in the Future and Its Strategy to Meet Those Needs

Air Force Studies Board · Division on Engineering & Physical Sciences · September 2011

The U.S. Air Force weapon system sustainment enterprise is extremely large in terms of scope, workforce, and associated costs that amount to billions of dollars annually. In addition, budget constraints will make it more difficult for the Air Force to continue on its current wartime-like operations. This report highlights many sustainment issues and offers recommendations aimed at improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the Air Force weapon system sustainment enterprise—a process that is enormously complex and, therefore, requires a comprehensive management approach.

Background

The total cost of Air Force sustainment activities, which is in the billions of dollars, exceeds the operating costs of such industry giants as American Airlines and Delta Airlines. The ability of the Air Force to keep its aircraft at an acceptable operational tempo is essential to fulfillment of its mission. Maintaining this capability, however, has become much more difficult today since the Air Force has effectively been operating on a wartime-like footing for the past 20 years. In addition, its aircraft have become increasingly more expensive to operate and maintain while future military spending will face growing constraints. Nevertheless, there are several actions the Air Force can take to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the Air Force weapon system sustainment enterprise.

Examining Aircraft Sustainability

U.S. Air Force weapon sustainment enterprise includes the support functions for maintaining the readiness and operational capability of weapons systems, subsystems, software, and support systems. The Air Force has always made it a priority to keep its aircraft operating at the ready for any mission the nation's leaders direct. This is determined by the number and variety of aircraft, the technology of the systems involved and the global deployment of the fleet.

The fleet's diversity—which ranges from aircraft designed and deployed in the 1950s to the world's most advanced high-performance fighters—weighs on the enterprise's operation. Additionally, the fleet mix has changed over the past 10 to 15 years from being typically hardware-oriented to today's platforms that are dependent on software for up to 80 percent of their functionality. The enterprise has become more complex over time, not only because of the fleet's increased growth and diversity, but due to global politics and regulations as well.

Incorporating Sustainability into Future Design

Today, sustainment activities are undertaken by numerous Air Force offices and organizations. The system has repeatedly met national and global threats, largely because of the dedication of the men and women responsible for the detailed tasks of sustainment. Sustainment activities require significant coordination and communication across a myriad of functions and organizations. At present, however, this process is largely facilitated by interpersonal relationships rather than clear, concise lines of authority and modern enterprise reporting and planning tools. These limitations result in escalating costs and inefficiencies.

While aircraft availability was considered a measure of merit, the Air Force did not provide any officially sanctioned sustainment goals. The lack of these goals affects the entire Air Force. That is, weak or overly broad policies, minimal governance and unnecessarily complex organizational structures contribute to systemic shortcomings that span the weapon system life cycle. The Air Force should establish sustainment goals that are specific and can be understood by all acquisition, contracting, engineering, and sustainment professionals.

Headquarters offices should set the tone for Air

Force sustainment. While field-level commanders and directors should take action to sustain their fleet, they deserve clear guidance and should be held accountable for execution.

In addition, continued reliance on aging aircraft—such as the B-52, C-130H, A-10, F-16 and C-5B—which have exceeded or will exceed their originally designed life spans, makes new materials, inspection systems and vehicle health monitoring technologies increasingly important. The Air Force should develop a "technology for sustainment" plan that identifies processes, technical agendas, workforce needs, and required funding resources. Unless significant numbers of legacy aircraft are retired, however, the high costs associated with Air Force weapon system sustainment will continue to directly impact the procurement of replacement and new systems.

Other recommendations for improving the Air Force's system sustainment include appointing a senior Air Force commander to be in charge of the entire sustainment enterprise and improving the spare parts chain. Overall, the Air Force sustainment enterprise process is enormously complex, and there is a need for the Air Force to address this process (?)

with a comprehensive and inclusive management approach.

Many of the recommendations made throughout the report address specific areas of the Air Force sustainment enterprise, and these recommendations can produce a positive improvement in operational effectiveness, cost efficiency, systems availability and overall responsiveness. A systems approach, however, that prioritizes and balances the implementation of each of these recommendations will be required for the Air Force to achieve these goals.

Committee on Examination of the U.S. Air Force's Aircraft Sustainment Needs in the Future and Its Strategy to Meet Those Needs: S. Michael Hudson Rolls-Royce North America (retired), Co-Chair; Michael E. Zettler, Z-Zettler Consulting, Co-Chair; Meyer J. Benzakein, The Ohio State University; Charles E. Browning, University of Dayton, Dianne Chong, The Boeing Company; David E. Crow, University of Connecticut; Frank R. Faykes, U.S. Air Force (retired); John T. Foreman, Software Engineering Institute, Carnegie Mellon University; Wesley L. Harris, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Howard F. Hetrick, Northrop Grumman Corporation; Clyde Kizer, Airbus North America (retired); Thomas A. McDermott, Jr., Georgia Tech Research Institute; Lyle H. Schwartz, University of Maryland; Bruce M. Thompson, Sandia National Laboratories; Raymond Valeika, Delta Airlines (retired)

Staff: Carter W. Ford, Study Director; Kamara E. Brown, Research Associate; Sarah M. Capote, Research Associate; Norman M. Haller, Consultant; Zelda Patmon, Program Associate; Marguerite E. Schneider, Administrative Coordinator

This is a report of work supported by a grant between the U.S. Air Force and the National Academy of Sciences. Any opinions, findings, conclusions, or recommendations expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the view of the organizations or agencies that provided support for the project.

Copies of this report are available free of charge from <http://www.nap.edu>.

Report issued September 2011. Permission granted to reproduce this brief in its entirety with no additions or alterations. Permission for images/figures must be obtained from their original source.

© 2011 The National Academy of Sciences